

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-12, 15-18, 20-22, 26-27, 29-30, and 35-46, are presently pending in the application. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 5-6, 8-9, 11-12, 18, 20-22, 26-27, and 29-30. Applicant has cancelled Claims 7, 10, 13-14, 19, 23-25, and 28 and added Claims 35-46. Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a notice of allowance for this application in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that new independent Claims 35 and 42 along with corresponding dependent claims are described in the specification, and are believed allowable over the cited references.

Applicant has organized the following response to correspond to the independent claims.

**A. Claim 1 and Claims dependent therefrom are allowable because the asserted combination does not describe each and every limitation of the respective claims.**

Claims 1-10, 12-13, and 15 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,910,996 to Eggers et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Eggers") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,957,053 to Moers (hereinafter referred to as "Moers"). See Office Action, pg. 2. Claims 11 and 14 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Moers, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,434 (hereinafter referred to as "Miyake"). See Office Action, pg. 8. Claims 16-17 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Moers and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,661,811 (hereinafter referred to as "Huemann"). Claims 7, 10, and 13 are now cancelled, thereby rendering the corresponding rejections moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the remaining rejections for at least the following reasons.

Amended Claim 1 describes the digital signal processor generating both a first processed audio output signal based on the first audio signal from the first tuner and also a second processed output signal based on the second audio signal from the second tuner. In addition, Claim 1 describes both a first audio power amplifier configured to receive the first processed audio output signal and a second audio power amplifier configured to receive the second processed audio output. Claim 1 is rejected based on Eggers in view of Moers, where the asserted combination substitutes Moers' DSP (6) for Eggers' switching circuitry (41). See,

Office Action, pg. 2. Yet, Eggers describes a switching circuitry (41) that merely selects between inputs to provide only one selected input as an output to amplifiers 42 and 43. *See* Eggers Abstract, Col. 2, ll. 25-28, col. 2, ll. 41-44, Col. 5, ll. 42-50, Col. 5, l. 65- Col. 6, l. 3, Col. 6, ll. 6-9, and Col. 6, ll. 39-42. Furthermore, Moers describes a DSP receiving an output from only tuner circuit (2). *See* Col. 4, ll. 7-9. As further shown in Moers' FIG. 1, DSP (6) provides a single audio output to amplifier (8); Moers' does not show DSP (6) generating a second audio output from Moers' second tuner (3). Thus, the asserted substitution of Moers' DSP (6) for Egger's switching circuitry (41) provides only a single audio output selectively derived from either, but not both, Egger's radio tuner (34) or radio tuner (35) to both of Eggers' amplifiers (42) and (43).

In contrast, Claim 1 describes the digital signal processor generating both first and second processed audio outputs from respective first and second audio signals provided by respective first and second tuners. Furthermore, unlike the asserted combination, Claim 1 also describes that the first audio power amplifier is configured to receive the first processed audio output and also the second audio power amplifier is configured to receive the second processed audio output. As a result, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness because the asserted combination does not describe each and every limitation of Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant request allowance of Claim 1. In addition, Applicant submits that Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-12, and 15-17 are also allowable at least for the reason that the respective dependent claims depend from an allowable claim.

**B. Claim 18 and corresponding dependent claims are allowable because the asserted combination does not describe each and every limitation of the respective claims.**

Claims 18-23 and 25-28 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Moers. *See* Office Action, pg. 2. Claims 24 and 29 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Moers, further in view of Miyake. *See* Office Action, pg. 8. Claims 30 and 33 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Moers and further in view of Huemann. Claims 19, 24-25, 28 and 33 are cancelled, thereby rendering

the corresponding rejections moot. Applicant respectively traverses the remaining rejections for at least the following reasons.

Amended Claim 18 describes the digital signal processor configured to generate both a first digitally processed audio signal as a function the first tuner frequency setting and a second digitally processed audio signal as a function of the second tuner frequency setting. In addition, Claim 18 describes the first audio power amplifier is configured to receive the first digitally processed audio signal and the second audio power amplifier is configured to receive the second digitally processed audio signal. Applicant respectfully traverse the rejection's assertion that "Moers describes a digital signal processor (6) connected with the first tuner (3) and the second tuner (2)," *see* Office Action, pg. 6, because FIG. 1 shows that DSP (6) only receives a "baseband signal ... supplied via signal line (5) from an output of the first tuner (2)." *See* Moers Col. 5, ll. 7-9. In fact, Moers does not describe either Moers' second tuner (3) providing an audio signal to DSP (6) or Moers' DSP (6) providing a second baseband output corresponding to a second audio signal from Moers' second tuner (3). Instead, Moers' DSP only receives an audio input from Moers' first tuner (2).

In contrast to Claim 18, Eggers describes switching circuitry (41) that selects between inputs to provide a single selected input as an output to both amplifiers (42) and (43). *See* Eggers Abstract, Col. 2, ll. 25-28, col. 2, ll. 41-44, Col. 5, ll. 42-50, Col. 5, l. 65- Col. 6, l. 3, Col. 6, ll. 6-9, and Col. 6, ll. 39-42. Also, Moers describes DSP (6) receiving one baseband signal from Moers' first tuner circuit (2). *See* Col. 4, ll. 7-9. Thus, unlike Claim 18, the asserted combination would not describe the digital signal processor further configured to generate both a first and a second digitally processed audio output as a function of the respective first and second tuner frequency setting because neither Moers nor Eggers describe providing a second digitally processed output as a function of a second tuner frequency setting. Moreover, the asserted combination would not describe both the first audio power amplifier configured to receive the first digitally processed audio signal and the second audio power amplifier configured to receive the second digitally processed audio signal, as described by Claim 18, because neither Eggers nor Moers describes a first and second digitally processed audio outputs to respective first and second power amplifiers as a function of the respective first and second tuners. Thus, the asserted combination fails to establish a

Serial No. 10/789,599  
Response to Non-Final Office Action of Nov. 14, 2006  
Response dated March 14, 2007

Filed: February 27, 2004


*prima facie* obviousness because the combination does not describe each and every limitation of Claim 18.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 18 is in form for allowance. Applicant also submits that dependent Claims 20-22, 26-27, and 29-30 are allowable at least for the reason that the independent Claim 18 is an allowable claim.

### **Conclusion**

The application is believed to now be in condition for allowance, which Applicant earnestly requests. Should the Examiner deem a telephone conference to be beneficial in expediting examination and/or allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Sanders N. Hillis  
Attorney Reg. No. 45,712  
Attorney for Applicant

---

SNH/kh/bal  
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
CUSTOMER NO. 27879  
Telephone: 317-636-0886  
Facsimile: 317-634-6701